



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image"—strictly, while they violate it by erecting statues to eminent warriors and others; but this objection scarcely deserves a serious reply. The commandment must be taken as a whole; and the making of a graven image or likeness, which is forbidden in the first clause, is obviously limited by the words immediately following—namely, that it must not be done for the purposes of religious worship. Such is the view which the ancient Fathers uniformly take of the meaning of this commandment. In their arguments with the heathen philosophers they continually assert that the Almighty has condemned *all* use of images in religious worship as unlawful, whatever plausible reasons may be adduced in its support; and we cannot but lament the perversity which induces the Church of Rome, notwithstanding the plain declarations of both Scripture and primitive antiquity, to cling so pertinaciously to what we conceive to be a very dangerous error.

We have left ourselves space but for a word or two on the second subject in our correspondent's letter—namely, the miracles ascribed to Roman Catholic saints. "Sidrach" charges us with extreme gullibility, but we cannot see upon what grounds. Our East Indian correspondent stated two facts of which he was personally cognizant—namely, that there is a black image of the Virgin to be seen in a church at Tournay, and that the sextoness gave him a particular explanation of the origin of the phenomenon. We ask, what proof is this of gullibility? Our correspondent, we may confidently affirm, did not himself believe the story, nor did we. But "Sidrach," while declaiming loudly against knavery and credulity, does not explain why the priests of the Church of Rome allowed the black image to be erected in the Church of Tournay, unless they wished the people to believe the supposed miracle. The statue clearly could not have been placed there against their will; and unless they were illiterate, they could scarcely have imagined that the Virgin really had a black face. They either believed the miracle themselves, or they wished the people of Tournay to believe it; and in either case we fear that "Sidrach's" charges of knavery and credulity are but too truly applicable somewhere. We gladly concur with him in the very just remarks which he makes on the general character of miraculous interpositions, and the evidence by which they ought to be supported; but we shall hereafter, perhaps, take occasion to examine how far the principles which he so correctly lays down tend to establish or to refute some of the miracles which are sanctioned and acknowledged by the Church of Rome.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In your January number, in the article on the "Touchstone," reply to objection 24, the following passage appears:—"And Roman Catholics themselves must maintain that the words of institution cannot be understood absolutely literally; since, if we understand these words in their most literal sense, we must believe that it is the *cup*, and not the wine in it, which is changed into blood." As you wish your correspondents to confine themselves to a single question in each letter, I shall, in this, confine myself to a few remarks upon the above passage, and shall not inquire into the truth or validity of the other arguments in the paper on the "Touchstone." It appears to me that, in your other reasons in reply to this objection, you can have but little confidence yourself, when you are compelled, in aid of them, to resort to such a reason as that contained in the passage I have quoted. In the first place, when you speak of Roman Catholics understanding "the words of institution" in a particular sense, you depart from the question in dispute. The question has no reference to "the words of institution," but to that part of those words which contains the assertion. Your proposition is, that the assertion, "this is my blood," must be taken figuratively, because the word "this" relates to an antecedent which is used in a figurative sense. This is your argument put into plain language; and it is no less illogical than would be the general proposition that wherever the subject is a figurative expression, the predicate, or the thing predicated of it, cannot be taken in a literal, but must be taken in a figurative sense.

I will take, as an illustration, a passage from your Protestant version of the Psalms:—"Mark the perfect man and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace." The word "upright," in its primary and literal sense, signifies "straight;" but, like many other words, it has acquired a figurative sense when applied to other than sensible objects, which sense is as well known and as generally received as its primary sense, or perhaps more so. If you asked me whether I understood the words—"the end of that man is peace"—in a literal or a figurative sense, and I answered, in a literal sense, you might or might not agree with me; but if I said, I can only understand them in a figurative sense, because if I took them in a literal sense I should also take the word "upright" in the same sense; and then it would follow that none but straight-backed men could hope for this promise of a peaceful end. If you did not laugh at my folly, you would, in your next number, assure

your "respected correspondent" that he had been guilty of very bad logic. The word "cup," however, to express the liquor in the cup, is as well known in that sense as in its literal sense. When we say "the kettle boils," though we use a figurative expression, yet we use an expression as well understood as the expression "the water in the kettle boils;" and so, in the 22nd Psalm (Douay version), the words, "the chalice which inebrieth me," is as familiar in its meaning as if it had been said "the liquor in the chalice." Independent of this, there is nothing in the Gospel to show that the word "this," in the words of institution, relates to the cup at all; but, on the contrary, the context shows that the liquor, and not the cup, is spoken of and referred to. Thus, in St. Matt. xxvi. 27, it is said—"And taking the chalice, he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, drink ye all of this." *ἐξ αὐτοῦ*, "out of this." Drink what? Plainly, what was in the cup. And then, v. 27, our Saviour continues—"For this is my blood of the New Testament," &c. What is this? Plainly, what he had spoken of immediately before; what was in the chalice, and what he calls in the next verse—"this fruit of the vine." So, in St. Mark xiv. 23, it is said—"And having taken the chalice, and given thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it;" not of the cup taken literally, which would be nonsense; but of the wine (*ἐξ αὐτοῦ*, again), "from," or "out of it." Then follow the words—"And he said to them, This is my blood," &c. So far the word "this" may as well apply to one object as another; it does not, even grammatically, necessarily apply to the cup any more than its contents. There is, however, in Luke xxii. 20, the expression—"This is the chalice, the New Testament in my blood." Here the word "this" plainly relates to "chalice;" but unfortunately for your argument this chalice, taking it literally, is not asserted to be blood, but to be the testament in our Lord's blood. This is all that is to be found in the New Testament on this subject; and I, therefore, assert, that even in its literal sense, the cup or chalice is not asserted to be the blood. I also assert that the use of the name of a vessel to signify the thing contained in the vessel is so familiar in vulgar use, as to have, as it were, lost its figurative form in our minds, and that it cannot, therefore, be spoken of as a figurative expression, in the same manner as Protestants contend that the expression, "this is my blood," must be considered. And, lastly, I assert, that if the word "chalice" were ever so figurative, as here used, and if the word "this" ever so clearly applied to it, it would not follow that the rest of the sentence might not be read in its most literal sense; and that whether our Saviour spoke of the cup or the wine, would be a matter of perfect indifference, so far as relates to the question, in what sense the assertion he makes of that object, be it the cup or be it the wine, is to be understood.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
CATHOLICUS.

Our "respected correspondent," if we may venture to call him so without being taunted with the civility, has quite mistaken our meaning, in supposing that while we urge our friends and opponents to limit their communications to one subject at a time, we desire that they should confine themselves to a small part of a subject, or a single argument on one side or the other of any subject; on the contrary, we cordially desire that those who differ with us should come forward freely and manfully, and grapple with our arguments, and the whole of our arguments, upon every subject we discuss in our pages, and show us where we are in error, if we be so. We shall not be at all slow at admitting an error, either in matter of opinion or argument, if clear reasons be given us that it is an error. In the present case, our correspondent, "Catholicus," has not attempted to grapple with the main and important subject in question, whether our Blessed Lord spoke in a literal or in a figurative sense, when he said—"Take, eat; this is my body," and "This is my blood of the New Testament;" but merely criticizes an isolated argument, that "if we are to understand these words in the most literal sense, we must believe that it is the *cup*, and not the wine in it, which is changed into blood." "Catholicus" is right in trying *this* by the rules of common sense; and ought, in order to be consistent, to be equally ready to try the meaning of the words—"Take, eat; this is my body," by the rule of common sense.

We may readily admit (what seems to be the whole drift of his argument) that whatever may be the exact form of words used, if we are quite sure what will be understood by them by the persons addressed, that it is enough; and that must be the *true* sense, unless the contrary is distinctly stated. When we say "the kettle boils," every one understands us to mean, "the water." When we say, pointing to a map—"This is England, and this is France," no one understands us to mean that England is literally a sheet of paper. And when Jesus, who had a few hours before called himself a shepherd, and a door, and a vine, took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples; and also took the cup, and gave it to them to drink; they certainly could not understand him to mean that he was holding his own body in his own hands, and

asking them to drink out of the cup his own blood, which they knew was still in his living body washed and not in the cup of wine. The *natural* sense of his words was the *figurative*; and if the Disciples were mistaken in so understanding him, of which there is no proof whatever, when and where is the mistake explained?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—A layman often runs the risk of bringing forward as a novelty some combination of facts and arguments that the theologian thinks too familiar to mention. If, however, the information be such as is but little known to the unlearned, then to give it an extended publicity may effect as much practical good as to discover it for the first time. I, therefore, venture to call your attention to a text incessantly paraded as a proof of most various doctrines, and to a commentary on it that is little known, at least among us laymen. I mean the verse, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—Mat. xvi. 18.

The infallibility of the Church—meaning thereby its ecclesiastics—the infallibility of the Pope, and the necessity for adding the latter to the former, to produce an infallible resultant, are, by turns, proved by this isolated passage. It is quoted by the ignorant, who have no knowledge of Scripture but through such traditional quotations, and with more caution by the skilful controversialist. The Italian, who cannot see the Word of God, and learns his theology from the paintings, sculpture, and decorations of his temples, sees this verse written in gigantic letters of gold, some ten feet long, beneath the majestic dome of the fabric dedicated to the apostle whose successors it is supposed thus to exalt to superhuman power. In short, it meets one so often that it is natural to ask, not only what is its true meaning, but what is the interpretation given by the infallible interpreter, which all Roman Catholics are bound to accept as true. I do not profess to have discovered any such for the entire passage, though at some pains to do so; but I think there is one tolerably distinct upon the most important point—namely, What is the *foundation* on which the Church is built?

You, sir, may point out what has been said by the Fathers; my researches suffice to show that there is, at least, not that "unanimous consent" the Roman Catholic creed demands. The foundation is variously given—as St. Peter—as St. Peter with the Popes claiming as his successors—as our Lord himself—or as the confession of faith in Christ just made by St. Peter, and which called forth the expression. The second alone supplies Roman Catholics with any peculiar argument in their favour, and to the latter Protestants can offer no objection in point of doctrine, even if they do not quite agree in its correctness. Would it not be strange if this were the very interpretation that Roman Catholics are bound to adopt? I must believe it to be so, until some equally authoritative council shall rescind, or explain so as to annul, the following passage in the celebrated Council of Trent. * After noticing the propriety of opening their proceedings with a solemn confession of faith, it thus proceeds—"Wherefore it has thought good that the symbol of faith, which the Holy Roman Church makes use of, as being that principle wherein all who profess the faith of Christ must necessarily agree, and that firm and ONLY FOUNDATION against which the gates of hell shall never prevail,† be expressed in the very same words in which it is read in all the churches; which is as follows." Here is given the Creed, known as the Nicene, in the words given in the note,‡ and which every Protestant cordially believes, and will readily accept as the foundation of his faith and hopes, as well as of those believers, throughout all times and places, who form the Church to which he claims to belong. The language of the council is distinct: the reference identifies its object. Those who assert the infallibility of the council must yield to its decree. If they say I am mistaken in the meaning I put on it, let them point out how and why; I have as much right and capacity to explain its language as they, for in that they claim no infallible assistance. Who shall interpret the interpreters? But, in truth, there is no ambiguity; it is plainly stated, that the *only* foundation,

* Session III.

† "Matt. xvi." The original edition has no marginal references whatsoever to texts of Scripture; but those printed since, under ecclesiastical sanction, have, though it is hardly requisite that so familiar a verse should be thus formally identified.

‡ "I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things, visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God; and born of the Father before all ages; God of God, light of light, very God of very God; begotten not made; of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made: who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from the heavens, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; he suffered and was buried; and he rose again on the third day, according to the Scriptures; and he ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and again will come with glory to judge the living and the dead; of whose kingdom there shall be no end; and in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and Son; who with the Father and the Son together, is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the prophets: and one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen."